DOCUMENT RESUME

TM 000 518

ED 049 317

AUTHOR Kelly, Edward F.; Bunda, Mary Anne

TITLE The Development of a Survey Instrument for Evaluative Priorities: A Field Test.

PUB DATE Feb 71

NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, New York, February 1971

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29

DESCRIPTORS Administrative Personnel, *Communication Problems, Community Attitudes, *Evaluation Criteria, Evaluation Methods, Graduate Students, *Opinions, *Program Evaluation, *Rating Scales, Student Teachers, Surveys, Teachers

ABSTRACT

In order to examine empirically the priorities that different groups place on a common set of evaluative characteristics as they apply to a specific problem, a survey of five principal groups composed of professional evaluators, E.S.E.A. Title III staff, graduate students, local school staff, and administrators was conducted. An eighty-five item instrument employing a seven-point scale for applicability ratings was developed. Analysis suggests differences between some groups on some of the items. The device and methodology reported should improve communication between evaluators and clients, help focus evaluations in an efficient manner, and identify specific decisions that characterize the evaluative enterprise. A survey problem statement, instructions for completing the survey, distribution of responses for each item, and other relevant statistics are included. (Author/LR)

ED049317

The Development of a Survey Instrument for Evaluative Priorities: A Field Test[1]

by

Edward F. Kelly
Office of Instructional Resources
University of Illinois
Urbana-Champaign, Illinois

Mary Anne Bunda
Center for Instructional Research
and Curriculum Evaluation
University of Illinois
Urbana-Champaign, Illinois

Planning for the evaluation of educational institutions, programs, and products requires critical decisions to be made on the allocation of available resources within a diversity of priorities that reflect the evaluator, the client, and possible audiences. Efforts to examine this aspect of educational evaluation have not been reported in the literature. Specifically, attention has not focused on the characteristics that are judged most applicable by different audiences when a specific evaluation problem is viewed across a common set of evaluative characteristics.

Despite the state of the art, and the so-called crude level of development that describes many of its instruments, an obvious need and, in so many cases, a mandate for evaluation exists within the educational community today. When technologies are developed to satisfy that need, communication has to occur among several groups, especially during the planning and reporting of the evaluation. Language is always a problem, but when the educational evaluator, drawing as he must from many disciplines,

---

[1]Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Convention, New York City, 1971.

TM 000 518

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

attempts to plan and communicate with other groups, he frequently employs a terminology that operates with little efficiency for communication. Consequently, planning is difficult and communication harder.

The failure of some evaluators to recognize the limitations of their efforts and to communicate their constraints to their clients has resulted in an evaluative oversell that has frustrated and embittered many.

This study sought to develop a defensible categorization of evaluative characteristics and to use them as the basis for a survey to describe the priorities that six groups within the educational community held on a particular program evaluation problem.

A. Method

1. Subjects

The six groups surveyed were: (1) Undergraduate teachers-in-training, (2) Teachers, (3) Graduate students, (4) School and project administrators, (5) Evaluators, and (6) Community members. It was originally intended by the investigators to differentiate between school administrators, board members, and project administrators, but insufficient returns required the categories to be reduced to a single one, school and project administrators.

One hundred eleven respondents (Ss) returned usable survey instruments. Seventeen of the Ss were teachers-in-training; fifteen were teachers; eleven were graduate students; twenty-one were school or project administrators; twenty-one were evaluators; and twenty six were community members.

2. Instrument

To insure a survey instrument that possessed an acceptable level of content validity, a logical analysis of available evaluation models and theories was conducted and a list of eighteen characteristic elements composed. These elements described those aspects of evaluative procedures that were judged by the investigators to appear most frequently in the literature on evaluation. The eighteen characteristics were: (1) Decision, (2) Relationships, (3) Judgments, (4) Standards, (5) Description, (6) Cost, (7) Personnel, (8) Design, (9) Rationale, (10) Instrumentation, (11) Analysis, (12) Conclusions, (13) Language, (14) Information, (15) Services, (16) Coordination, (17) Planning, and (18) Objectives.

Positive statements describing the components of each of the characteristics were then composed. A total of eighty-five statements were written. In most cases, the number of statements composed for each characteristic varied according to the apparent complexity of the characteristic. The logical loading of the eighty-five items on the eighteen characteristics is given in Table 1.

Insert Table 1 About Here

All Ss were presented with a brief written description of a program evaluation problem situation (See Appendix), and were asked to judge the applicability of each of the eighty-five statements to that evaluation problem. When making this judgment, Ss were told to respond from the point of view they felt would most probably be theirs if they attended an evaluation planning meeting such as the one depicted in the problem statement. Judgments of applicability were made on a six-point scale that was defined as Not Applicable, Low, Somewhat, Moderate,

Considerable, and High Applicable. Respondents were instructed to omit items if they felt they had no reasonable basis for rating them or if they felt they did not understand them. The problem statement and the set of eighty-five items together with proportions of responses over the entire sample appear in the Appendix.

3. Data Reduction

Responses were collected on machine scorable answer sheets and were rendered for computer analysis.

4. Analysis

Data were analyzed for each of the six groups. The proportion of responses in each category for each item over all groups were computed. Means and standard deviations were also computed for the eighteen characteristics (subscores) for each of the six groups.

5. Results

A comparison of the group means on the eighteen characteristic subscores showed no apparent disparity. The difference between the group means on the characteristic subscores ranged from a low of .24 on the Decision subscore to 1.04 on the Objectives subscore.

Despite the similarity in group means on the ~~six~~ eighteen characteristics, when the subscores were ordered by means for each of the six groups and the rankings compared, some patterns appeared. Allowing that the differences between rankings for some groups were very small, only the three highest and the three lowest rankings are reported. Table 2 shows which characteristics were ranked highest and lowest by each of the six groups.

Insert Table 2 About Here

Of interest is the consistent appearance of the Rationale and Conclusions characteristics (9 and 10) as two of the three highest ranked characteristics in five of the six groups represented. Rationale's appearance in all six groups' top rankings may be the result of the use of only three items (8, 13, 30) to represent it and a corresponding response set on the part of Ss to recognize the obvious applicability of focus and raison d'etre in an evaluative effort or any other, for that matter. In a similar fashion, the emphasis on Conclusions may be both a reflection of an implicit "utility" criterion that works as a critical yardstick in questions of evaluative applicability as well as an indication that, whether they be drawn by the evaluator or the decision maker, the groups sampled saw Conclusions as an aspect of the evaluative effort that is highly applicable in program evaluation.

The Cost characteristic, attaining a high ranking by community members and a low one by school and project administrators, deserves mention. One reasonable interpretation of the reversal would be that the community members were more concerned with their pocketbooks than the administrators were, or alternatively, that the administrators questioned in this study had relegated fiscal concerns to the level of moderately inapplicable as far as planning for an evaluation was concerned. The latter interpretation would seem to defy usual expectations.

In order to determine whether any considerable disparity existed between groups, those items on which at least thirty per cent of the distribution fell above and below the midpoint were selected. On this basis, sixteen of the eighty-five items qualified. An examination was then made

to determine whether the item also appeared to differentiate between at least two of the six groups. Of the sixteen items, five seemed to present considerable between group differences.

Items such as Number 7, "The evaluator will present the committee with a range of instruments which might be used to collect data," and Number 57, "The evaluator will take precautions to insure that the findings generalize across time," showed satisfactory overall variability according to the thirty per cent decision rule, but they did not differentiate between any of the six groups. On the other hand, items 22, 37, 41, 49, and 61 elicited both high overall variability and considerable between group disparity. The group means and standard deviations for these items are summarized in Table 3. Since each of these items may be characterized by high variability in response in each group, exact response proportions are not presented. The extremely high score or low score is not of primary interest in each case, rather, the appearance of clusters of means is suggested.

Insert Table 3 About Here

---

6. Discussion

The results of the survey point to several problems with the instrument and with the description of priorities in the planning of program evaluations. It appears that unconstrained ratings of items may contribute to a positive response bias on the part of Ss. The problem definition placed no explicit constraints on the respondents. Time, money, or availability of personnel, for example, were not constrained in any way. It appears that in this hypothetical "best of all possible worlds", the individuals studied in this survey did not venture far from saying that all eighteen characteristics were at least moderately applicable to the problem.

It may be that the presence of no discrepancy between the groups on the eighteen characteristics, as well as on a considerable majority of the items, suggests that the use of an assumed role designation as a point of view from which applicability is to be judged does not provide a powerful basis for discriminating between the applicability of evaluation characteristics.

Moreover, the respondents may have been constrained by the investigators' own biases in item selection and the creation of an instrument of considerable length. Respondents required between twenty and thirty minutes to complete the form.

These inconclusive results seem to imply that titles or role designations that identify individuals participating in a program evaluation planning session may be an unreliable basis for predicting evaluative preferences. An individual's decision on the relative applicability of particular characteristics of an evaluative study may not be as closely related to his role designation as they are to other personal and ideosyncratic factors. Replication of these results would lend credence to this notion.

One clear pattern of response that seems to appear in these results is that on nine of the ~~sixteen~~ eight characteristics computed, the respondents who classified themselves a teachers-in-training (Group 1) scored the characteristic as more applicable than did any of the other groups surveyed. Although the differences do not possess any statistical reality, the strong pattern of response may suggest that teachers-in-training who have had only academic experience in the planning of evaluations, may exhibit a tendency to give high applicability to the theoretical dimensions of a program evaluation.

On the other hand, on eleven of the eight sixteen characteristics, community members (Group 6) judged the characteristic less applicable than did any of the other groups. In no instance did the community group give the highest rating to a characteristic, as compared to other groups. (See Table 4.)

Insert Table 4 About Here

Interpretation of this pattern of response may point to the heavy role that jargon played in the wording of the items on the instrument. It appears that when faced with unfamiliar jargon, the respondent may adopt either a standard role response (judging everything in the same direction), or he may consistently avoid the extremes of judgment and choose some scale midpoint. It would appear that the community members surveyed in this study chose the former mode and consistently rated items as having middle to low applicability.

It seems clear that both the individual items and characteristics contained in this form possess an applicability that will vary as the evaluation problem and its constraints do. Informal respondent interviews have suggested that one of the utilities of this form may lie in its reduction to a checklist for use by those engaged in the planning of evaluations. With the removal of items that appear primarily as indicators of internal consistency (21, 28, 33, 43, 48, 52, 57, 58, 63, 64, 70, 75, 76), the remaining statements should function as a valid checklist that would be especially useful for those untutored in the tradeoffs implied by most evaluative planning decisions. Employed then as an aid to communication between evaluator and client, early, explicit decisions and understandings of the weights that will be allocated to such matters as judgment, causality,

and instrumentation, for example, may facilitate both communication and problem focus while helping all parties avoid the frustrations of unfulfilled expectancies which have frequently been the trademark of program evaluations.

APPENDIX

Evaluation Characteristics Survey
Problem Statement

Wessex is a comprehensive 9 - 12 high school located in a suburban community in the Northcentral United States. Serving essentially a well-settled, middle and upper middle class community, the school's present student population numbers approximately 2,300. As the result of a request put forth by a local community action group and supported by both the teachers' and administrators' local professional associations, the school board and district staff allocated funds to be used to support an evaluation of the school's social studies program by an outside team of evaluation specialists.

As one important part of the planning of the evaluation, a steering committee composed of key district staff, administrators, teachers, students, community members, and evaluators was formed and requested to compose a list of points that should be observed during the planning, conducting, and reporting of the evaluation. A preliminary list of those points has been prepared and distributed to the committee for their judgments on the applicability of each of the items.

Please assume that you hold a seat on the committee described above, and from your own point of view, complete the attached form according to instructions.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING THE EVALUATION CHARACTERISTICS SURVEY

1. Please Note:

   A. Use ONLY PENCIL.
   B. Do not write on the question sheets.
   C. Record all responses on the answer sheet.

2. In column number 1 of the space labeled STUDENT NUMBER blacken the number that most clearly identifies the role you would most likely assume if you were to attend the evaluation planning meeting just described. Choose only one.

ROLE	CODE
Teacher-In-Training	0
Graduate Student	1
Teacher	2
School Administrator	3
School Board Member	4
Project Administrator	5
Evaluator	6
Community Member	

3. Enter the following information in the space labeled STUDENT NUMBER under the designated column.

COLUMN #	HIGHEST DEGREE HELD	CODE
2	Elementary Diploma	0
	Secondary Diploma	1
	Bachelors Degree	2
	Masters Degree	3
	Advanced Certificate	4
	Doctorate	5

4. COLUMN # 3 — Have you ever participated in an evaluation planning session? 0 = No, 1 = Yes

5. Complete the information box on SEX.

6. Please read each of the 85 statements describing various characteristics of an evaluation and in the corresponding space on your answer sheet rate the applicability of that characteristic to the evaluation problem just described. In rating the applicability of each characteristic, use the following scale:

1	2	3	4	5	6
NOT APPLICABLE	LOW	SOMEWHAT	MODERATE	CONSIDERABLE	HIGHLY APPLICABLE

If you feel you do not understand an item or if you feel you have no reasonable basis for rating it, leave the item blank.

When you have completed all items, please return all materials.

Thank you.

ITEMS USED IN THE SURVEY
AND THE PROPORTIONS IN THE
TOTAL RESPONSE DISTRIBUTION (N=111)

1. In cases where instruments must be developed, sufficient time will be allocated for development, try-out, and revision, before the instruments are used as part of the evaluation.

   NA .02 L .00 S .05 M .08 C .29 HA .54 OMIT .03

2. Certain phases of the implementation of the evaluation will be scheduled by the teachers and administrators in the school.

   NA .04 L .05 S .12 M .19 C .31 HA .27 OMIT .03

3. The recommendations given by the evaluators will be both global and specific.

   NA .03 L .01 S .08 M .15 C .31 HA .41 OMIT .02

4. The evaluation report will have a section devoted exclusively to recommendations which the evaluators will make concerning program improvement.

   NA .01 L .03 S .05 M .14 C .23 HA .54 OMIT .01

5. The evaluation plan will include alternate days for data collection and alternative methods of collection to allow for unforseen problems.

   NA .05 L .08 S .13 M .22 C .24 HA .27 OMIT .01

6. Various reporting modes will be used in presenting the final information package.

   NA .03 L .09 S .14 M .14 C .36 HA .24 OMIT .00

7. The evaluator will present the committee with a range of instruments which might be used to collect data.

   NA .04 L .09 S .17 M .32 C .24 HA .14 OMIT .00

8. The specific questions to be considered during the course of evaluation will be clearly stated.

   NA .02 L .00 S .03 M .14 C .17 HA .64 OMIT .00

9. Conclusions drawn by the evaluators will be clearly supported by the analysis of the data.

NA .00 L .03 S .02 M .14 C .23 HA .59 OMIT .00

10. The origins of the standards used in making judgments will be stated.

NA .05 L .02 S .06 M .09 C .32 HA .46 OMIT .00

11. The evaluation will collect credible information that has utility for decision makers.

NA .02 L .02 S .04 M .09 C .31 HA .52 OMIT .01

12. Various methods of data collection will be used for each type of data.

NA .02 L .15 S .16 M .22 C .20 HA .24 OMIT .01

13. The rationale of the evaluation will be clearly stated in both the planning stage and in the final report.

NA .00 L .02 S .04 M .14 C .31 HA .50 OMIT .01

14. The normal operation of the school will not be unduly disrupted by evaluation activities.

NA .01 L .03 S .05 M .15 C .32 HA .43 OMIT .00

15. The language of the evaluation reports will be conversational and free of jargon.

NA .05 L .05 S .11 M .21 C .29 HA .30 OMIT .00

16. The description of the program will be organized according to a set of appropriate theoretical constructs.

NA .05 L .09 S .16 M .24 C .23 HA .13 OMIT .10

17. There will be a single final report presented to the administration and the community.

NA .07 L .14 S .05 M .21 C .22 HA .30 OMIT .02

18. Planning time will be provided for the evaluation.

NA .00 L .01 S .03 M .06 C .27 HA .60 OMIT .03

19. The analysis procedures will provide an efficient and economical mode for reporting trends in the data gathered.

NA .03 L .05 S .09 M .20 C .37 HA .22 OMIT .05

20. Judgments will be based upon information whose reliability and validity are known.

NA .00 L .09 S .12 M .16 C .26 HA .36 OMIT .01

21. Information will be presented which is based upon data collection devices which vary in mode and time of collection.

NA .04 L .06 S .15 M .22 C .32 HA .19 OMIT .03

22. The evaluation will include statements which imply causality among parts of the program.

NA .08 L .14 S .11 M .23 C .21 HA .17 OMIT .07

23. The instruments used in the evaluation will be published standardized tests.

NA .20 L .41 S .18 M .11 C .09 HA .01 OMIT .01

24. The design of the evaluation will guard against results which may be due to factors other than the program itself.

NA .07 L .09 S .11 M .15 C .25 HA .30 OMIT .03

25. The analysis of the data will not be limited to strict statistical tests.

NA .05 L .04 S .08 M .14 C .25 HA .41 OMIT .03

26. Time and money will be budgeted for consultant services.

NA .03 L .07 S .13 M .18 C .30 HA .29 OMIT .01

27. Facilities and personnel of the school will be available for implementing the evaluation.

NA .01 L .03 S .00 M .19 C .35 HA .41 OMIT .01

28. The evaluation team will use supportive community services whenever necessary.

NA .04 L .05 S .12 M .25 C .23 HA .30 OMIT .01

29. Inferences made upon the data will be clearly distinguishable from recommendations which the evaluators make.

NA .01 L .04 S .08 M .15 C .30 HA .37 OMIT .05

30. The data collected by the various instruments will be relevant to the questions under consideration in the evaluation.

NA .02 L .01 S .01 M .06 C .32 HA .58 OMIT .01

31. The evaluation will contain a report of judgments made by several groups concerning the worth of the program.

NA .05 L .06 S .11 M .19 C .30 HA .29 OMIT .01

32. The planning of the evaluation will be a cooperative venture carried on by the evaluation team and the committee in consort.

NA .04 L .03 S .09 M .10 C .32 HA .41 OMIT .02

33. The evaluator will be required to state the basis upon which his judgments of program worth are based.

NA .02 L .02 S .04 M .14 C .25 HA .53 OMIT .00

34. Interim evaluation reports will be presented to the committee and administration.

NA .04 L .08 S .10 M .34 C .22 HA .22 OMIT .01

35. The evaluation will provide information for those in decision making positions.

NA .01 L .01 S .04 M .04 C .31 HA .59 OMIT .01

36. The evaluator will be responsible for synthesizing the data and drawing conclusions relevant to questions asked about the program.

NA .02 L .03 S .05 M .14 C .41 HA .34 OMIT .01

37. All statements of program objectives will indicate a specific behavior, a desired level of performance of that behavior, and the conditions that will surround that behavior.

NA .05 L .12 S .13 M .24 C .23 HA .22 OMIT .03

38. The evaluation team will be the sole author of the final evaluation report.

NA .09 L .14 S .14 M .17 C .19 HA .26 OMIT .01

39. The evaluation team will communicate well with each other and with the committee.

NA .01 L .02 S .02 M .12 C .23 HA .60 OMIT .00

40. A member of the committee will serve as a coordination agent, acting as liason between the school staff and the evaluation team.

NA .06 L .06 S .12 M .18 C .31 HA .27 OMIT .00

41. The names of the people who will be making the decisions about the future of the program will be made known during the planning phase.

NA .22 L .16 S .10 M .15 C .18 HA .18 OMIT .01

42. Part of the evaluation will be presented as an oral report to an open meeting of parents, teachers, and administrators.

NA .03 L .11 S .10 M .20 C .23 HA .32 OMIT .01

43. The implementation of the evaluation will be coordinated with the activities of the school.

NA .02 L .03 S .06 M .12 C .40 HA .36 OMIT .02

44. Attempts will be made to control the quality of information collected.

NA .05 L .05 S .06 M .11 C .30 HA .40 OMIT .03

45. Recommendations for program improvement will be made informally by the evaluators during the final committee meeting.

NA .11 L .20 S .14 M .20 C .23 HA .13 OMIT .01

46. The total cost of the evaluation will be stated in an itemized budget.

NA .04 L .05 S .07 M .17 C .30 HA .37 OMIT .01

47. The evaluation will describe the priorities that have been assigned to the program objectives.

NA .00 L .00 S .08 M .20 C .38 HA .34 OMIT .00

48. The evaluation will try to find out what aspects of the program are causally related.

NA .07 L .06 S .08 M .20 C .35 HA .21 OMIT .03

49. The school staff will specify the measurable objectives that represent the intended outcomes of the program.

NA .06 L .08 S .15 M .25 C .26 HA .16 OMIT .03

50. The recommendations which the evaluators make will be clearly traceable to contingencies found in the data gathered.

NA .03 L .04 S .06 M .14 C .29 HA .41 OMIT .04

51. The evaluation team will consist of individuals who possess various skills, i.e., meansrement specialists, subject matter specialists, etc., to insure that the skills and abilities necessary to complete the evaluation are available.

NA .01 L .02 S .00 M .09 C .27 HA .59 OMIT .02

52. The evaluator will collect judgments concerning the worth of the program.

NA .05 L .03 S .10 M .25 C .32 HA .22 OMIT .03

53. The total program will be described in the evaluation so that an outsider could understand "what it was all about" just by reading the report.

NA .03 L .05 S .09 M .21 C .31 HA .32 OMIT .01

54. The total cost of the evaluation will be decided upon through joint agreement of the committee and the evaluators.

NA .07 L .02 S .09 M .19 C .32 HA .27 OMIT .05

55. An appropriate design will guide the planning and implementation of the evaluation.

NA .03 L .01 S .06 M .16 C .40 HA .33 OMIT .01

56. The report will contain statements which assign confidence levels to research findings given as part of the evaluation.

NA .03 L .08 S .14 M .26 C .25 HA .15 OMIT .09

57. The evaluation will take precautions to insure that the findings generalize across time.

NA .08 L .13 S .14 M .19 C .22 HA .18 OMIT .07

58. The evaluation will contain a description of the logical relationships among the parts of the program.

NA .01 L .05 S .08 M .22 C .32 HA .29 OMIT .03

59. When the evaluator makes conclusions, he will be responsible for stating explicitly the basis upon which he made those conclusions.

NA .00 L .05 S .05 M .12 C .28 HA .50 OMIT .01

60. The final report will contain graphs, charts, and other schema to illustrate the quantitative data collected.

NA .01 L .07 S .10 M .23 C .23 HA .32 OMIT .04

61. Copies of the evaluation report will be considered to be the property of the administration of the school, and they will decide who receives the information.

NA .29 L .18 S .08 M .14 C .13 HA .15 OMIT .03

62. Data collection will occur when data should be collected rather than when it is convenient to collect data.

NA .05 L .11 S .14 M .12 C .22 HA .35 OMIT .03

63. The committee will share the authorship of all reports concerning the evaluation study.

NA .14 L .20 S .12 M .22 C .23 HA .06 OMIT .04

64. The evaluation will report instances where there is discrepancy between what was intended to occur and what actually occurred in the program.

NA .00 L .01 S .05 M .13 C .37 HA .43 OMIT .01

65. The evaluation will eventuate in predictions about possible future outcomes or contingencies.

NA .02 L .07 S .11 M .23 C .33 HA .20 OMIT .05

66. The specific decisions that have to be made will be indicated as soon as possible.

NA .03 L .04 S .09 M .21 C .28 HA .32 OMIT .05

67. The evaluation team will maintain a non-threatening and supportive atmosphere.

NA .00 L .02 S .05 M .09 C .26 HA .58 OMIT .01

68. The evaluation will report instances where what was intended by the staff actually occurred.

NA .04 L .03 S .09 M .14 C .28 HA .42 OMIT .01

69. There will be a number of school staff assigned as full-time members of the evaluation team.

NA .13 L .17 S .13 M .20 C .23 HA .12 OMIT .04

70. The evaluation will not intrude upon the normal schedule of the program.

NA .05 L .08 S .12 M .22 C .26 HA .26 OMIT .02

71. The evaluation will develop criterion measures for each objective of the program.

NA .04 L .05 S .11 M .15 C .34 HA .27 OMIT .05

72. The evaluation team will assume the major responsibility for developing measurable objectives that represent the program.

NA .07 L .15 S .11 M .23 C .24 HA .15 OMIT .04

73. Certain phases of the implementation of the evaluation will be carried out at the sole discretion of the evaluator.

NA .13 L .17 S .12 M .26 C .20 HA .08 OMIT .05

74. Decisions on the allocation of time and money for the evaluation will be arrived at through the joint consideration of the committee and the evaluators.

NA .05 L .05 S .12 M .19 C .33 HA .25 OMIT .01

75. The evaluator will indicate his criteria for judgments he makes about discrepancies between what was intended and what actually occurred.

NA .01 L .02 S .05 M .15 C .33 HA .41 OMIT .03

76. The planned allocation of time for the evaluation will be stated.

NA .03 L .05 S .10 M .22 C .32 HA .27 OMIT .01

77. Some findings of this evaluation will be applicable to other programs in the same school setting.

NA .13 L .07 S .18 M .23 C .23 HA .12 OMIT .04

78. The evaluation will develop an empirical description of the relationships among the parts of the program.

NA .02 L .06 S .12 M .27 C .27 HA .14 OMIT .12

79. The evaluation team will use supportive school services whenever necessary rather than outside agencies.

NA .02 L .08 S .14 M .25 C .28 HA .18 OMIT .05

80. Standards used by the evaluator will be acceptable to the local decision maker.

NA .08 L .06 S .13 M .23 C .23 HA .23 OMIT .03

81. All intended outcomes of the program will be stated in measurable terms.

NA .09 L .08 S .10 M .17 C .33 HA .21 OMIT .02

82. A survey of educational research relevant to the program will be included as part of the evaluation report.

NA .04 L .12 S .20 M .16 C .25 HA .22 OMIT .02

83. The recommendations presented by the evaluation team will be feasible, given the school climate and staff.

NA .02 L .01 S .07 M .14 C .34 HA .39 OMIT .04

84. The evaluator will be required to make judgments about the worth of the program.

NA .04 L .05 S .12 M .16 C .30 HA .32 OMIT .02

85. When other groups make judgments about the program, their criteria will be stated.

NA .02 L .02 S .05 M .17 C .29 HA .41 OMIT .05

TABLE 1

Logical Loading of Eighty-Five Items
on Eighteen Evaluative Characteristics

Evaluative Characteristics	Logical Item Loadings
1. Decision	35, 41, 66
2. Relationships	22, 48, 50, 58, 64, 68, 78
3. Judgments	20, 31, 52, 84
4. Standards	10, 33, 75, 80, 85
5. Description	16, 53
6. Cost	46, 54
7. Personnel	39, 51, 67, 69
8. Design	24, 55, 57, 77
9. Rationale	8, 13, 30
10. Instrumentation	1, 7, 12, 21, 23, 44
11. Analysis	19, 25, 56, 65
12. Conclusions	3, 4, 9, 29, 36, 59, 83
13. Language	6, 15, 38, 63
14. Information	11, 17, 34, 42, 45, 60, 61, 82
15. Services	26, 27, 28, 79
16. Coordination	2, 5, 14, 40, 43, 62, 70, 73, 74
17. Planning	18, 32, 76
18. Objectives	37, 47, 49, 71, 72, 81

TABLE 2

Three Characteristics Rated Highest and Lowest
in Applicability
by Six Groups

Group Number and Name	Three Characteristics Ranked: Highest	Lowest
1. Undergraduate Teachers-in-Training	9. Rationale 12. Conclusions 4. Standards	14. Information 10. Instrumentation 13. Language
2. Teachers	9. Rationale 12. Conclusions 17. Planning	8. Design 14. Information 13. Language
3. Graduate Students	9. Rationale 7. Personnel 12. Conclusions	10. Instrumentation 13. Language 5. Description
4. School and Project Administrators	9. Rationale 17. Planning 7. Personnel	14. Information 10. Instrumentation 6. Cost
5. Evaluators	9. Rationale 17. Planning 12. Conclusions	14. Information 8. Design 18. Objectives
6. Community Members	9. Rationale 12. Conclusions 6. Cost	10. Instrumentation 1. Decision 13. Language

TABLE 3

Group Means and Standard Deviations for
Items Showing Greatest Variability

Item 22. The evaluation will include statements which imply causality among parts of the program.

Group Number	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Group Number	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
1	4.59	1.58	4	4.40	1.50
2	3.80	1.74	5	3.61	1.54
3	3.45	1.44	6	3.55	1.47

Item 37. All statements of program objectives will indicate a specific behavior, a desired level of performance of that behavior, and the conditions that will surround that behavior.

Group Number	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Group Number	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
1	5.29	.92	4	4.48	.98
2	4.23	1.54	5	3.38	1.53
3	3.91	1.64	6	3.88	1.51

Item 41. The names of the people who will be making the decisions about the future of the program will be made known during the planning phase.

Group Number	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Group Number	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
1	3.88	1.82	4	3.10	1.84
2	3.40	1.84	5	4.48	1.57
3	3.00	1.84	6	2.92	1.81

Item 49. The school staff will specify the measurable objectives that represent the intended outcomes of the program.

Group Number	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Group Number	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
1	4.63	1.02	4	4.33	1.32
2	3.67	1.23	5	3.67	1.49
3	4.10	1.60	6	4.12	1.64

TABLE 3 - Continued

Item 61. Copies of the evaluation report will be considered to be the property of the administration of the school, and they will decide who receives the information.

Group Number	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Group Number	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
1	2.47	1.55	4	3.86	1.90
2	3.29	1.77	5	3.42	2.04
3	3.91	1.70	6	2.23	1.66

Group Key:

1 = Undergraduate Teachers-In-Training

2 = Teachers

3 = Graduate Students

4 = School and Project Administrators

5 = Evaluators

6 = Community Members

TABLE 4

High and Low Means for Groups
on Sixteen Evaluative Characteristics

Characteristic	High		Low	
	Group Number	$\bar{X}$	Group Number	$\bar{X}$
1. Decision	1	4.94	6	4.03
2. Relationships	1	5.05	5	4.44
3. Judgments	1	4.90	6	4.34
4. Standards	1	5.23	6	4.61
5. Description	1	4.76	3	3.86
6. Cost	3	5.10	4	4.05
7. Personnel	3	5.33	6	4.73
8. Design	3	4.55	5	4.06
9. Rational	1	5.59	5	5.08
10. Instrumentation	2	4.33	6	4.06
11. Analysis	1	4.83	6	4.37
12. Conclusions	1	5.36	6	4.92
13. Language	46	4.33	6	3.74
14. Information	3	4.38	6	4.14
15. Services	4	4.92	5	4.36
16. Coordination	3	4.66	6	4.25
17. Planning	3	5.23	6	4.75
18. Objectives	1	4.87	5	3.83

Group Key:

1 = Undergraduate Teachers-In-Training
2 = Teachers
3 = Graduate Students
4 = School and Project Administrators
5 = Evaluators
6 = Community Members